

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/788,985	02/27/2004	Michael Wimmer	FA1193USNA	6843		
23906 E I DU PONT	7590 02/06/2007 DE NEMOURS AND C	EXAMI	EXAMINER			
LEGAL PATENT RECORDS CENTER			MAKI, ST	MAKI, STEVEN D		
BARLEY MILL PLAZA 25/1128 4417 LANCASTER PIKE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
WILMINGTO	N, DE 19805		1733			
		•	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			02/06/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/788,985	WIMMER ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Steven D. Maki	1733	

•	Steven D. Maki	1733	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 16 January 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 Cl	rce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 3_months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or one of the mailing date of the period for reply expire is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or one of the period for reply expires is not expected.	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejecti	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Offi te of the final rejection, o	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as even if timely filed,
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further contained the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below).	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially re		the issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: <u>see advisory action attachment</u> . (See 37 C		ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mnliant Amendment (PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		mphant / anonamone (1 102 024).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).	lowable if submitted in a separate,		
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:	☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wil vided below or appended.	ll be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) rejected: 1-11.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>12</u> . <u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	t before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affiday	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> rit or other evidence is	t be entered necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu see advisory action attachment.		n condition for allowar	nce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		

Advisory Action Attachment

new issues

The new issues include:

- (1) in claim 1 line 5, changing "comprising" to --consisting of--;
- (2) in claim 1 part D), inserting --at least one organic solvent as-- before "flow agent";
- (3) in claim 1, amending step c) to recite --assembling at least one coated electrical steel sheet coated electrical steel sheets obtained in step b) ...--;
- (4) in claim 2, after "adding components B) E)" inserting --wherein the composition has a solids content of 30% to 60%--; and
- (5) in claim 7, changing "polyglycol" to --diethylene glycol monobutylether--.

<u>remarks</u>

With respect to Japan 723's disclosure to use phenol resin and dicyandiamide in the aqueous composition, applicant acknowledges that claim 1 recites "comprising". See pages 8-9 of the response filed 1-16-07. Furthermore, applicant recognizes that "... the possibility of presence of a phenol resin, in addition to the dicyandiamide, as curing agent, is not ruled out" (page 9 of after final filed 1-16-07). Examiner agrees that claim 1 reads on and fails to exclude phenol resin. Arguments based on the claimed invention using dicyandiamide without any phenol resin, therefore, are not persuasive

Art Unit: 1733

since claim 1 recites "comprising" and thereby reads on and fails to exclude phenol resin.

Applicant's arguments regarding "flow agent" are not commensurate in scope with the claims and are therefore not persuasive. Claim 1 fails to require a flow agent which increases the film formation during the curing process at a higher temperature. Claim 1 fails to require a flow agent which is neither an agent to increase dispersion properties nor an agent to influence membrane properties. Instead of requiring an agent having the property of increasing film formation during the curing process at a higher temperature, claim 1 merely recites "flow agent". In claim 1, "flow agent" is sufficiently broad to read on polyethylene glycol nonionic surfactant as disclosed by Japan 574. Polyethylene glycol nonionic surfactant is a "flow agent" as described in claim 1 because polyethylene glycol nonionic surfactant reduces surface tension and thereby affects the flowability of the aqueous coating composition. This conclusion that "flow agent" in claim 1 reads on polyethylene glycol is consistent with claim 7 which recites "polyglycol is used as a flow agent". It is noted that Japan 574 motivates one of ordinary skill in the art to use polyethylene glycol in Japan 723's aqueous coating composition for a steel sheet to acquire excellent coating stability and corrosion resistance.

Applicant argues and examiner agrees that Japan 574 uses polyethylene glycol nonionic surfactant to keep the resin emulsion stable (page 5, paragraph 29). Examiner adds that polyethylene glycol nonionic surfactant is a "flow agent" as described in claim 1 because polyethylene glycol nonionic surfactant reduces surface tension and thereby

Application/Control Number: 10/788,985

Art Unit: 1733

affects the flowability of the aqueous coating composition. This conclusion that "flow agent" in claim 1 reads on polyethylene glycol is consistent with claim 7 which recites "polyglycol is used as a flow agent".

Applicant's remaining arguments relate to the new issues and are not persuasive because as noted on the Advisory Action form PTOL 303, the after final amendment filed 1-16-07 will not be entered.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven D. Maki whose telephone number is (571) 272-1221. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Fri. 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Crispino can be reached on (571) 272-1226. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Steven D. Maki February 1, 2007

STEVEN D. MAKI